1 2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

LEONARDO GUZMAN VASQUEZ,

Plaintiff,

MARK ALBERT MORLOK, et al.,

Defendants.

v.

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

/// 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case No. 1:24-cv-01068-KES-SAB

ORDER RE STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME FOR DEFENDANT PENSKE LOGISTICS TO RESPOND TO **COMPLAINT**

(ECF No. 11)

On April 1, 2025, the parties filed a stipulation to extend time for Defendant Penske Logistics to file a responsive pleading until April 25, 2025. (ECF No. 11.) The parties agree that the last day for Penske to respond was March 10, 2025. (But see ECF No. 9 at n.1.) Requests for extensions brought on the required filing date—and certainly those brought well after the required date—are looked upon with disfavor. L.R. 144(d). Counsel are admonished that future requests for extensions of time shall be timely brought before the Court.

An initial extension of time to respond to the complaint that does not exceed twenty-eight days does not need to be approved by the Court. L.R. 144(a). Given the parties' agreement that Defendant Penske's deadline to file a responsive pleading was March 10, 2025, the requested extension of time here is for more than 28 days. Accordingly, it requires court approval, and the parties should have submitted a proposed order. See L.R. 143(b). In the future, the parties shall submit a proposed order when filing a stipulation that requires court approval.

Based on the stipulation of the parties, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Penske Logistics shall file a pleading responsive to the complaint on or before April 25, 2025. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **April 3, 2025** STANLEY A. BOONE United States Magistrate Judge